

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application and entry of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested.

The title has been amended, as requested by the Examiner.

The specification has been amended to make reference to sequence identifiers and to include the Sequence Listing submitted herewith on separate sheets. Entry of the Sequence Listing does not raise the issue of new matter as the sequence information contained therein is presented in the application as originally filed. The computer readable copy of the Sequence Listing submitted herewith is the same as the attached paper copy of that Listing.

The specification has also been amended to capitalize "BIACORE", as requested by the Examiner. No further revision is believed necessary as generic terminology is present in the application as filed (see, for example, page 31, lines 16-19).

The claims have been amended to define the invention with additional clarity. Specifically, claim 16 has been amended so as to be placed in independent form. Claims 30 and 41 have been revised to delete the term "neutralizing".

The Examiner's objection to Fig. 12 is noted. A further copy of that figure is submitted herewith. The attached copy of that figure that was found to be acceptable in the parent case.

A new Abstract is provided herewith, as requested by the Examiner.

The Examiner's comments regarding the oath/declaration are noted. An newly executed document will be submitted shortly.

Claims 16, 3, 7-13, 17, 18, 28, 4-6, 29 and 31-40 stand provisionally rejected as allegedly representing obviousness-type double patenting on claims of Application No. 09/960,717. Given the provisional nature of the rejection, the Examiner is urged to hold it in abeyance until the case is otherwise in condition for allowance.

Claims 30 and 41 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly being non-enabled. Withdrawal of the rejection is believed to be in order for the reasons that follow.

Claims 30 and 41 have been revised to delete the term "neutralizing". This revision has been made as the rejection appears to be based on the Examiner's concerns regarding the phrase "neutralizing antibodies".

The Examiner is urged to reconsider his position in view of the revision and withdraw the rejection.

This application is submitted to be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is requested.

HAYNES et al
Appl. No. 10/664,029
March 24, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: Mary J. Wilson
Mary J. Wilson
Reg. No. 32,955

MJW:tat
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

HAYNES et al
Appl. No. 10/664,029
March 24, 2005

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawing (Fig. 12) replaces the drawing as originally filed.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet